



**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
COLUMBIA DIVISION**

WILLA A. PEMBLETON,	§	
Plaintiff,	§	
	§	
vs.	§	Civil Action No.: 3:22-3989-MGL-SVH
	§	
HONORABLE FRANK KENDALL, SECAF;	§	
NAJEE CRAWFORD, <i>Director of Human</i>	§	
<i>Resources</i> ; COREY DENSON; COMMANDER	§	
20TH FW; COMMANDER 20TH FSS;	§	
FRANCIS FAPPIANO; CAPT AMY A.	§	
ALLGOOD (ABRAMO); ERICA N. BROWN;	§	
JEROME C. BROWN; TANYA WYATT;	§	
CMSGT DONALD PEDRO; AMERICAN	§	
FEDERATION OF GOVERNMENT	§	
EMPLOYEES; COMMANDER, 20TH	§	
LOGISTICS READINESS SQUADRON,	§	
Defendants.	§	

**ORDER ADOPTING THE REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION,
DENYING APPLICATION TO PROCEED WITHOUT PREPAYING FEES OR COSTS
AND GRANTING FOURTEEN DAYS TO SUBMIT THE REQUIRED FILING FEE**

Plaintiff Willa A. Pembleton (Pembleton), proceeding pro se, filed a civil rights complaint against the above-named Defendants.

This matter is before the Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (Report) of the United States Magistrate Judge recommending the Court deny Pembleton's application to proceed without prepaying fees or costs and grant Pembleton fourteen days to submit the required filing fee if she wishes to pursue this action. The Report was made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636 and Local Civil Rule 73.02 for the District of South Carolina.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight. The responsibility to make a final determination remains with the Court. *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270 (1976). The Court is charged with making a de novo determination of those portions of the Report to which specific objection is made, and the Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge or recommit the matter with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

The Magistrate Judge filed the Report on November 15, 2022. To date, Pembleton has failed to file any objections. “[I]n the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must ‘only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.’” *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note). Moreover, a failure to object waives appellate review. *Wright v. Collins*, 766 F.2d 841, 845–46 (4th Cir. 1985).

After a thorough review of the Report and the record in this case under the standard set forth above, the Court adopts the Report and incorporates it herein. Therefore, it is the judgment of the Court Pembleton’s application to proceed without prepaying fees or costs is **DENIED**.

Pembleton is granted **fourteen days from the date of this order** to submit the required filing fee if she wishes to pursue this action. If she fails to do so, the Court will dismiss this case without prejudice.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Signed this 7th day of December 2022, in Columbia, South Carolina.

s/ Mary Geiger Lewis
MARY GEIGER LEWIS
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL

The parties are hereby notified of the right to appeal this Order within sixty days from the date hereof, pursuant to Rules 3 and 4 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.